



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

BARTHOLOMAEUS ANGLICUS AND HIS ENCYCLOPAEDIA

I

In the twenty-eighth volume of the *Études Franciscaines* (1912)¹ M. Matrod discussed the work of two English Franciscans of the thirteenth century—Roger Bacon and Bartholomaeus Anglicus. After quoting the opinion of M. Langlois, that the *De Proprietatibus Rerum* had exercised a profound influence upon European culture for 300 years, M. Matrod gave his own estimate of the importance and influence of Bartholomaeus' work:²

En plein XIII siècle, il modèle, du fond de sa cellule, la pâte dont sera faite la littérature la plus éblouissante de l'Angleterre, et sans son oeuvre, celle de Shakespeare, qui vient immédiatement dans l'ordre des chefs d'oeuvre, après celle du Dante et celle d'Homère, ne peut être comprise.

Many students of the works of Shakespeare and his contemporaries have recognized the importance of the *De Proprietatibus Rerum* as a source for the scientific knowledge of the Elizabethan writers. Douce called Bartholomaeus "our English Pliny," and referred to his encyclopaedia some eighteen times in explaining doubtful passages from the plays. In a brief note he gave a short account of the book and some rather inaccurate information concerning the author.³ Anders included the *De Proprietatibus Rerum* in *Shakespeare's Books*, referring to it about five times, while Furnivall went further than his predecessors and printed nine chapters from the eighth book of Batman's edition of Trevisa's English translation of the *De Proprietatibus Rerum* to prove that this encyclopaedia was the main source from which Shakespeare derived his knowledge of astronomy.⁴ Furthermore, there was among the Ireland forgeries a copy of Berthelet's edition with 'William Shakespeare, his Booke 1597' inscribed on the title page. These facts show that Shakespeare was at least familiar with the book, whether he owned a copy or not, and that it was an important reference book.

¹ Pp. 468-83.

² Pp. 478-9.

³ Douce, *Illustrations of Shakspeare* (London, 1807), 2:278-9.

⁴ *New Shakspeare Society Transactions* (1877-9), pp. 431-50.

Other students of the natural science and the geography of the Middle Ages have studied the portions of the *De Proprietatibus Rerum* in which they were particularly interested, and occasionally printed extracts from the Latin text or one of the six translations. In 1893 Robert Steele edited some extracts from the Berthelet edition.⁵ His purpose in editing these extracts was to give a general notion of the scientific and astronomical knowledge of the Middle Ages. No attempt was made to make a special study of the author or of the importance of the encyclopaedia. Professor Cian devoted one chapter to Bartholomaeus in his study of *Vivaldo Belcalzer e l'Enciclopedia Italiana delle Origini* (1902).⁶ His chief interest centered in Bartholomaeus' relation to the history of the encyclopaedia in Italy and the probability that Belcalzer's work was a translation of the *De Proprietatibus Rerum*. The most important study of Bartholomaeus' geographical knowledge has been made by A. E. Schönbach, who printed the results of his investigation concerning Bartholomaeus' description of Germany in the *Mitteilungen des Instituts für Oesterreichische Geschichtsforschung* (1906).⁷ Herr Schönbach printed thirty-three chapters of the Latin text from Book 15. A few other less important studies of Bartholomaeus in his relation to the Franciscan culture or the literature of the Middle Ages have been made, but no one else has made a careful study of the encyclopaedia as a whole, comparing it with the other thirteenth century encyclopaedias or endeavoring to fix its place in the history of the encyclopaedic writings of the Middle Ages. This I have endeavored to do and also to collect as many facts as possible concerning the author of the *De Proprietatibus Rerum*.

Until the middle of the eighteenth century the author of the *De Proprietatibus Rerum* was thought to have been a member of the Glanville family of Suffolk and to have lived about the middle of the fourteenth century. This mistake dates from the sixteenth century, when Leland in his *Commentarii de Scriptoribus Britannicis* introduced his brief account of Bartholomaeus with this sentence: 'Bartholomaeus

⁵ Steele, R., *Medieval Lore* (London, 1893).

⁶ *Giornale Storico della Letteratura Italiana*, Sup. 5.

⁷ 27:54-90.

Glannovillanus ex noblissimo, ut ego colligo, genere Comitum Sudovolcarum eiusdem appellationis originem duxit.⁸ Bale, Pits, Wadding, and Fabricius copied from Leland, merely adding a few sentences to the account which they found.

The brief account given by Fabricius may be quoted as typical of the tradition concerning the life and writings of Bartholomaeus before the more modern investigations.⁹

Bartholomaeus Anglicus *de Glanvilla*, sive *Glannovillanus*, ex Comitibus Sudovolgii sive Suffolciensibus, (Lelando Sudovolcaris,) Monachus Ord. Minor. circa A. 1360. auctor Operis in *libros XIX. distributi de proprietatibus rerum* Argent. 1488. 1505. Norimb. 1492. Francof. 1601. longe diversum a Thomae Cantipratani opere de natura rerum, de quo infra, atque editum quoque sub titulo *allegoriarum* sive *tropologiarum in utrumque Testamentum*, Paris. 1573. addito libro XX. *de rerum accidentibus*, numeris, mensuris, ponderibus et sonis: et libro *de proprietatibus apum*. Etiam Gallicam hujus operis versionem jussu Caroli V. Galliarum Regis a Joanne Corbichone compositam vidisse se Lelandus cap. 348. testatur, et partem illius esse puto quem Baleus singillatim nominat librum *de Mundo ac coelestibus*. *Sermonum liber*, editus Argentor. 1491. Inedita apud Baleum VI. 15. memorantur: *Chronicon de Sanctis*. *Postillae Scripturarum*. Quibus librum contra Laurentium Vallam, et *Practicam* adjungit Pitseus pag. 495. quae *Practica Juris* vocatur apud Waddingum pag. 50. *De Postilla in Matthaeum et Marcum* adeundus Warthonus ad Caveum. At de libro contra Vallam merito dubitat Vossius & cum Bartholomaeo altero, Facio nempe nostrum confusum a Pitseo suspicatur, neque enim fert aliud temporum ratio, cum Valla quinquagenarius obierit A. 1457.

Leland, it appears, confused the author of the *De Proprietatibus Rerum* with a Bartholomaeus de Glanvilla of Suffolk, who died about 1360. Although the Glanville family was prominent in Suffolk and Norfolk as early as 1170, none of its members can be identified with the English Franciscan. The date 1360 seems to have originated from the belief that the Latin text was written only a short time before the translations were made. The French translation is dated 1372 and the English 1398.

The first author to question these traditional facts was Quetif, who contradicted the earlier writers in his *Scriptores Ordinis Praedicatorum*.¹⁰ By a careful study of the manuscripts of the *De Proprietatibus Rerum*, he proved that Leland's Bartholomaeus could not have been the author of the encyclo-

⁸ Ed. Oxonii, 1709, p. 336.

⁹ *Bibliotheca Latina Mediae et Infimae Aetatis* (Hamburg, 1734). 1:479-80.

¹⁰ 1:468.

paedia and that this work must have been written before the end of the thirteenth century. Jourdain proved in his *Recherches Critiques sur l'Age et l'Origine des Traductions Latines d'Aristote* (1843)¹¹ that the author of the encyclopaedia must have flourished in the thirteenth century rather than the fourteenth, for the work must have been completed before 1260. Jourdain was led to this conclusion from the fact that Bartholomaeus used the translations of Aristotle which were made from the Arabic. These translations were not discarded until after 1260, when a direct translation from the Greek text was completed. Furthermore, it is probable that Bartholomaeus would have used the compilations of Thomas of Cantimprè and St. Thomas Aquinas if he had written after 1260. Bartholomaeus did not pretend to be an original author and was always careful to give his authorities, frequently citing contemporaries. Robert Grosseteste (d. 1253) is the latest author mentioned in the list of authorities. Albertus Magnus (d. 1280) is cited twice in Book 17 (chs. 2 and 137) of the *De Proprietatibus Rerum*, although he is not mentioned in the list of authorities. Albertus was an old man when he died, and it is possible that Bartholomaeus may have been acquainted with his theories when they were both in Paris about 1230.

Delisle devoted a short section to Bartholomaeus in an article, *Sur les Propriétés des Choses*, in the *Histoire Littéraire* (1888)¹² He showed that the Bartholomaeus Anglicus mentioned in a letter written by the Franciscan General in 1230 must have been the author of the *De Proprietatibus Rerum*. Wadding had mentioned this letter in his *Annales Minorum*,¹³ but had failed to recognize that this Bartholomaeus Anglicus and Bartholomaeus de Glanvilla, whom he mentioned later as the author of the *De Proprietatibus Rerum*, were the same. Delisle was also the first to question the tradition that Bartholomaeus was an Englishman. He endeavored to prove by numerous quotations from the *De Proprietatibus Rerum* that Bartholomaeus was a Frenchman. His main argument is based upon a comparison of the descriptions of France and England. Bar-

¹¹ Pp. 358-60.

¹² 30:353-65.

¹³ 2:248.

tholomaeus seems to have loved France and Paris particularly, for he says of that city:¹⁴

Nam sicut quondam Athenarum Ciuitas mater liberalium artium et literarum, philosophorum nutrix, et fons omnium scientiarum Greciam decorauit, sic Parisius nostris temporibus non solum Franciam immo totius Europe partem residuam in scientia et in moribus sublimauit. Nam velut sapientie mater de omnibus mundi partibus aduenientes recolligit, omnibus in necessariis subuenit; pacifice omnes regit, et tanquam veritatis cultrix debitorum sapientibus et insipientibus se ostendit.

On the other hand, it seemed to Delisle that the description of England failed to show a similar appreciation. France, he implied, is praised and given special prominence, while England is almost neglected. Bartholomaeus' description of England is summarized in six lines of poetry at the end of the chapter, *De Anglia*:¹⁵

Anglia terra ferox [ferax?] et fertilis angulus orbis,
Insula predives, que toto vix eget orbe
Et cuius totus indiget orbis ope.
Anglia plena iocis gens libera apta iocari,
Libera gens cui libera mens et libera lingua,
Sed lingua melior liberiorque manus.

Cian suggested that these verses may have been written by Bartholomaeus himself, since the author simply says they were written by 'someone describing the English Island.' They show, according to Cian, a certain notable pride in the author's native land, while the chapters on France show gratitude for the kindness which had been shown Bartholomaeus during his sojourn in that country as a student and professor.¹⁶ Moreover, it was customary for the students of the thirteenth century to consider Paris a second Athens. At this period the schools of Paris had surpassed the once famous schools of Chartres and were drawing students from every part of Europe. Hardly a hundred years had passed since Abelard had defied his teacher, William of Champeaux, and had emphasized the importance of dialectic, and consequently of the works of Aristotle.

Delisle felt that his theory received additional support from the statement by Bartholomew of Pisa that Bartholomaeus

¹⁴ Book 15, ch. 57. All quotations from the *De Proprietatibus Rerum* are taken from the edition published in Nürnberg in 1483.

¹⁵ Book 15, ch. 14.

¹⁶ Cian, p. 38.

was 'de provincia Franciae.' This phrase may simply mean the territory of the Franciscans, as Cian thought. But such an interpretation is not necessary to prove that Bartholomaeus was not a Frenchman. Bartholomaeus of Pisa would naturally refer to him as 'de provincia Franciae,' because he had spent his earlier years as a student and teacher in France and consequently was considered a citizen of France, though born in England.

From a sentence in a French manuscript it appears that Bartholomaeus was once thought to have been a Scotchman.¹⁷ This statement is denied by the translator:

Il apparait clairement en ce chapitre que l'auteur de ce livre ne fut pas escot mais fut englois, et pour ce, il le croira qui voudra en ce partie.

Bartholomaeus' attitude toward the Scotch is typically English. In fact, he was almost a thirteenth century Samuel Johnson in his treatment of his northern neighbors, for he thus described them:¹⁸

Nam gens est leuis, animo ferox, seuiens in hostes, tantum fere mortem diligens quantum seruitutem, in lecto mori reputans segniciem, in campo autem contra hostem interfici ut interficiantur gloriam arbitrans et virtutem. Gens parci victus, famem diutius sustinens, et raro ante occasum super cibum se effundens, carnibus lacticiniis, piscibus, et fructibus magis vtens, panis usus Britannicis minus habens, et cum populus sit satis, elegantis figure et faciei pulcre generaliter a natura, multum tamen eos deformat proprius habitus siue scotica vestitura; . . . mentiri non verentur . . . in propriis gaudent, pacem non diligunt.

Wackernagel's suggestion that the *De Proprietatibus Rerum* was of north Italian origin requires no more than passing notice, since he did not know that Bartholomaeus was the author of the sections which he found in a manuscript with the title, *De Orbe et eius Divisione ac Universis Regionibus Totius Mundi*. His suggestion is based upon the theory that the author must have been better acquainted with Italy than with any other country, because in the chapter *De Tuscia* all the chief cities are mentioned by name, while in the other geographical chapters only a very few of the cities are given.¹⁹

¹⁷ Maxwell, H., "An Englishman's Opinion of Scotland in 1360," *Notes and Queries*, VIII, 11, 224-5.

¹⁸ Book 15, ch. 152.

¹⁹ Wackernagel, W., "Geographie des Mittelalters," Haupt's *Zeitschrift für Deutsches Alterthum*, 4 (1844), 479-95.

In spite of these attempts to prove the contrary, it is certain that Bartholomaeus was an Englishman. Not only the early manuscripts but also the Franciscan chroniclers of the thirteenth century refer to him as Bartholomaeus Anglicus. All doubt as to the exact meaning of the adjective is removed by a note on the last leaf of a thirteenth century manuscript of St. Paul's *Epistles* in the Library of Chartres:²⁰

Iste liber est Fratrum Predicatorum Carnotensium, quem habuerunt a Fratre Bartholomaeo, qui fuit Anglicus.

The earliest reference to Bartholomaeus Anglicus is found in a letter from the Minister General of the Franciscan Order to the minister in France. The General wrote to France to inform the head of that province that Johannes Anglicus had been appointed Minister of Saxony at the death of Simon Anglicus, the first Minister of Saxony and 'primus lector Magdeburgensis,' and that Bartholomaeus was to be the new lector at Magdeburg.²¹ In 1231 Jordanus sent Brother Joannes de Penna and Brother Deodatus to France to accompany the newly appointed officers to Saxony.²²

At this time Bartholomaeus was a professor at the Franciscan school in Paris, where he had given a course of lectures on the whole Bible. We are told this by Salimbene, who refers to Bartholomaeus' chapter on elephants:²³

Item in historia Alexandri filii Philippi regis Macedonie legitur, quod ipse rex Alexander habuit in exercitu suo centum elefantas, qui aurum suum portabant. Horum animalium in Etyopia magna copia est, quorum naturam et proprietates frater Bartholomaeus Anglicus ex ordine Minorum in libro, quem de proprietatibus rerum fecit, sufficienter posuit; quem etiam tractatum in xix libellos divisit. Magnus clericus fuit et totam Bibliam cursorie Parisiis legit.

²⁰ *Catalogue Général des Manuscrits des Bibliothèques Publiques de France*, 11:177.

²¹ '1230. Scripsit ergo Minister Generalis ad Franciae Ministrum, ut fratrem Joannem Anglicum Saxoniae Administrationi, fratrem Bartholomaeum Anglicum lectionis praeficiendum, dimitteret' (Wadding, 2:248).

²² '1231. Missi hoc anno a fratre Jordano Custode Thuringiae, in virtute potestatis sibi factae a Generali Ministro, frater Joannes de Penna et frater Deodatus Lutetiam ad Franciae Ministrum pro conducendis Fratribus Joanne Anglico Generali jam constituto Saxoniae Ministro, et Bartholomaeo item Anglico, ut in eadem Provincia Fratribus sacrum legeret Theologiam; qui statim concessi a Franciae Ministro, Provinciam Saxoniam egregie decorarunt' (Wadding 2:274).

²³ *Monumenta Germaniae Historica; Scriptores*, 32:94.

Bartholomaeus must have been middle aged at the time of his appointment, because it is not probable that a young man would have held this position in Paris, or would have been chosen to carry on the educational work at Magdeburg.

Schönbach thinks that Bartholomaeus probably received his education at Oxford.²⁴ This, he says, would account for his being so well acquainted with contemporary English authors, such as Michael Scotus, Robert of Lincoln, Alfredus Anglicus, and Alexander Neckam. We have no records of Bartholomaeus as an Oxford student, and it seems hardly necessary to advance this theory to account for his acquaintance with the works of English authors. It would have been natural for an Englishman who was studying in France to have been especially interested in the works of his own countrymen. Moreover, Paris was at this time the intellectual center of Europe, and the works of English scholars were well known in the schools and university. General works, such as Bartholomaeus would need for his compilation, were in special demand in this age of scientific and philosophical inquiry. If Bartholomaeus had been a Frenchman, these works would have been known to him, even tho he had never visited England or Oxford.

It seems more probable that Bartholomaeus received his early education at Chartres, which was frequented by English students in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. At the beginning of the thirteenth century the fame of an Englishman John of Salisbury (d. 1180), who had taught at Chartres and had been made bishop in 1176, was at its height. This alone would tend to attract students from England. Furthermore, Chartres was becoming at this time a preparatory school for the University of Paris and offered courses which would tempt the student whose ultimate goal was Paris. It appears that Bartholomaeus was specially interested in the school at Chartres, for he gave the Dominican Brothers there a copy of St. Paul's *Epistles*. It is not likely that a Franciscan would have given such a valuable book to the Dominicans unless there was some special tie to connect him with their school. Two famous lecturers at Chartres in the twelfth century—Gilbert de la Porée and William of Conches—are given in the list of authorities at

²⁴ Schönbach, p. 64.

the beginning of the *De Proprietatibus Rerum*. At the close of the twelfth century or during the opening years of the thirteenth, the teaching of these men would still have been remembered and their books studied as authorities.

If Bartholomaeus studied at Chartres during the early years of the thirteenth century, he would not have considered that his education could be completed there. Since the days of Fulbert, when the schools of Chartres gained a place of prominence rivaled by no other episcopal or monastic school, changes had taken place. About the middle of the twelfth century they began to neglect the study of the quadrivium and were eclipsed by the schools of Paris.²⁵ In the thirteenth century the schools of Chartres became a stepping stone to the higher education at Paris. It is probable, therefore, that Bartholomaeus, if he had studied at Chartres, went to Paris to complete his studies. At Paris he must have become acquainted with some of the members of the newly founded Franciscan Order, which he soon joined. At least by 1230, about twenty years after Saint Francis had founded the order, Bartholomaeus had gained a reputation as a scholar and teacher among the Franciscans.

Nothing is definitely known about the life of Bartholomaeus after he left Paris in 1231. His name does not appear again in the annals or chronicles of the Franciscans, until Salimbene and Bartholomaeus of Pisa refer to his encyclopaedia at the end of the thirteenth century. These references show that Bartholomaeus' great work was well known by 1280 and used as an authority. His life at Magdeburg was probably spent in teaching and reorganizing the Franciscan school there. He may have revised part of his encyclopaedia or added short sections, but it does not seem likely that he had the leisure or the facilities to rewrite any large portion.

From the few facts which may be definitely ascertained concerning the life of Bartholomaeus Anglicus, we are justified in assuming that he was probably born in England about 1190; that he spent the first thirty years of his life in study at Chartres and Paris; that the next ten years were spent in teaching in the Franciscan school at Paris and in compiling the *De Proprietatibus Rerum*; and that during the last years of his life he taught at Magdeburg and helped to direct the work of the Franciscans

²⁵ See Clerval, *Les Écoles de Chartres*, p. 320.

in Saxony. It is probable that Bartholomaeus died shortly after the middle of the thirteenth century.

II

The *De Proprietatibus Rerum* was the most popular encyclopaedia of the thirteenth century, which has been called the age of Encyclopaedias. The intellectual renaissance of the preceding century had stimulated a desire for learning, which was scarcely to be surpassed by that of the humanists themselves. This renaissance was due largely to the teaching of Abelard, whose new attitude toward secular knowledge was instrumental in replacing the *credo ut intelligam* of Anselm by the *intelligo ut credam* of the later thinkers. Abelard wrote concerning knowledge:²⁶

If therefore it is not wrong to know, but to do, the evil is to be referred to the act and not to the knowledge. Hence we are convinced that all knowledge, which indeed comes from God alone and from His bounty, is good. Wherefore the study of every science should be conceded to be good, because that which is good comes from it; and especially one must insist upon the study of that *doctrina* by which the greater truth is known. This is dialectic, whose function is to distinguish between every truth and falsity: as leader in all knowledge it holds the primacy and rule of all philosophy. The same also is shown to be needful to the Catholic Faith, which cannot without its aid resist the sophistries of schismatics.

It was impossible for the great number of students to acquire at first hand a knowledge of every science. The universities could not accommodate all those who desired to learn, and most students could not collect a library large enough to meet their needs. Even the clergy, whom the popes of the first half of the thirteenth century desired to raise to a higher intellectual level, did not have the leisure nor the inclination required to read the voluminous works of the Fathers and of the secular authors. For these an easier method of instruction had to be provided. The burden of popularizing and spreading secular and religious knowledge fell upon the shoulders of the Friars.

The Dominicans and Franciscans had not been founded for this purpose, but they were forced to assume the duty, because their work was organized in all the countries of Europe. Even the education of their own numbers, which increased with amazing rapidity, required the leaders of the orders to find

²⁶ Taylor, H. O., *The Mediaeval Mind*, 2:349.

some means of spreading knowledge. They solved the problem by writing encyclopaedias, in which they collected the opinions of the best known authorities. These encyclopaedias varied in comprehensiveness and arrangement, but the educational aim was never forgotten nor subordinated to any other. These works were to be the textbooks and reference books for the preachers and scholars, who did not have access to a library and who could not afford to collect one of their own. Through their intellectual activity in this field the scholars of these two great orders won for the thirteenth century the title of the Age of Encyclopaedias.

Bartholomaeus' work surpassed in popularity the earlier encyclopaedias, such as the *Institutiones Divinarum et Humanarum Litterarum* by Cassiodorus and Isidore's *Etymologies*, because it was primarily a scientific encyclopaedia and not a handbook of the arts. The compilations of the contemporaries and successors of Bartholomaeus were too large and discursive to be used as textbooks and consequently were not so widely known as the *De Proprietatibus Rerum*. The largest of these is Vincent de Beauvais' *Speculum Magnum* in three volumes, which is compared with the *De Proprietatibus Rerum* by Cian. He concludes that Bartholomaeus was surpassed by Vincent in design and vastness but is superior to Vincent in method.²⁷ Alexander Neckam's *De Naturis Rerum* is similar to Bartholomaeus' work but is too brief and illustrated by too many stories for the use of the student.

The *De Proprietatibus Rerum* was probably written before the author went to Saxony. After the investigations by Jourdain and Delisle were published, it was generally assigned to the first half of the thirteenth century. Schönbach tried to prove that the work must have been written before 1240, because Berthold of Regensburg, who wrote between 1240 and 1250, used it as a source.²⁸ On a leaf (305 v.) toward the end of a fifteenth century manuscript of the French translation of the *De Proprietatibus Rerum* in the Bibliothèque de l'Arsenal, Paris, the transcriber has written:²⁹

²⁷ Pp. 47-8.

²⁸ Pp. 56-62.

²⁹ This manuscript is dated 1472.

L'acteur de ce livre des proprietiez des choses ne s'est point voulu nommer pour son humilite, afin qu'il ne semblast aux lisans qu'il en eust voulu avoir gloire, mais il appert par le langaige d'aucuns des chapitres de ce livre qu'il estoit natif du royaume d'Angleterre et fest ledit livre en latin environ l'an mil cciiii.

This date is undoubtedly too early, but it shows that only about 250 years after the time of Bartholomaeus there was a tradition at least that the work had been written early in the thirteenth century. A careful study of the numerous manuscripts would perhaps result in showing that Bartholomaeus finished his work before going to Saxony. If the superiors of his order had known that he had written this great textbook during his professorship at Paris, they would have had an additional reason for desiring to have him direct the work in the newly organized province of Saxony. One is not justified in assuming that Bartholomaeus described from personal observation any part of Europe, when he failed to cite an authority. Undoubtedly he learned much about Flanders, Holland, and Germany from the students at Paris, before he visited these countries. It is possible that Bartholomaeus rewrote a portion of his encyclopaedia after leaving Paris, but probably the work was finished before 1230 and contributed largely to his fame as a scholar and teacher.

Bartholomaeus wrote his compilation primarily for the student of theology and for the preacher. In the *Prohemium* he says that his purpose is to explain the allegories of the Scriptures 'ad edificationem domus Domini.' I do not agree with Cian, who considers these words conventional and believes that Bartholomaeus' purpose was primarily scientific and secondarily moral. As Schönbach has pointed out,³⁰ Bartholomaeus stressed the relationship to Scriptural interpretation in the introductions to books which contain the greatest amount of scientific material. It is as though he were answering the objection that he had forgotten his aim and was dealing with science for its own sake. The Middle Ages could not so soon break away from the old idea that secular knowledge was the handmaid of theology. The arrangement of the material is somewhat modified by this purpose. The earlier books are devoted to theology, while the last part of the encyclopaedia

³⁰ Pp. 59-60.

deals with science in its relation to theology. In the books on birds, animals, stones, etc., Bartholomaeus emphasizes the fact that he has treated these subjects because a knowledge of them is needed to interpret the Scriptures.

Schönbach divided the *De Proprietatibus Rerum* into two parts, the second part beginning at Book 8.³¹ This division was suggested to him by the fact that the Innsbruck manuscript (no. 256), which he studied primarily, began with the eighth book. This is not conclusive proof, for students often excerpted sections of the encyclopaedias to use as textbooks for special subjects. In this case the sections dealing with theology and physiology were omitted. Manuscript No. 2287 in the University Library at Prague contains Books 1-9, while short excerpts from various parts of the work are to be found in other manuscripts. The argument that Bartholomaeus had the relationship to the Scriptures continually in mind in the last part (Books 8-19), while in the first part a knowledge of this relationship was presupposed, is not based upon facts. Bartholomaeus frequently mentioned that his work was written merely that the spiritual things might be known through the material. For example he concluded the nineteenth chapter of the third book thus:

In his ergo et in aliis operationis nature conditionibus admiranda est diuina sapientia, quae per ista et talia similia dat nobis quammodo intelligere qualiter per ista sensata materialia ad intellectum eorum quae sunt supra sensum, sint paulatim cordis interiora ad intelligentiam spiritualium promouenda, et propter hoc ista simpliciter est in hoc opusculo mea intentio et finis meus.

Schönbach also felt that the nature of the introductions to the different books justified his division. But they are too similar in nature to be of much value in determining such a division. In many cases they are merely transitional paragraphs, such as the introduction to Book 3:

Adiuuante Iesu Christo in precedentibus aliquas proprietates de substantia penitus incorporea diuina, scilicet natura et angelica, quantum ad hoc spectat opusculum, breuiter introduximus; nunc cum eiusdem interueniente auxilio ad creaturam corpoream stilum conuertamus, a dignissima creaturarum, scilicet homine, qui naturam et proprietatem sapit, tam corporum quam spirituum, inchoantes.

A comparison of this introduction with that to Book 15, which is typical of those in Schönbach's second part, will show the

³¹ Pp. 58-61.

futility of the attempt to divide the *De Proprietatibus Rerum* by the statements at the beginning or end of the various books:

De terre autem partibus et diuersis prouinciis per quas orbis generaliter est diuisus pauca huic operi sunt adiuuante Domino breuiter inferenda. Non tamen de singulis dicendem, sed solummodo de his de quibus Sacra Scriptura sepius inuenitur facere mentionem.

If the work is to be divided at all, it must be divided according to subject matter. The first three books form the first section, treating incorporeal substances (God, the angels, and the soul). The second part (4-7) is devoted primarily to man (the humours and elemental qualities, the parts of the body, the ages of man, and medicine). The third section (8-18), which treats of the universe, may be divided into two parts. The first (8-13) has for its subject the world in general (the world and the heavens, the divisions of time, matter and form, air, birds, water and fishes), and the second the earth in particular (the earth and its parts, geography, stones, trees and plants, and animals). The fourth section is composed of the nineteenth book, in which everything, not previously discussed, finds a place (colors, odors, savors, liquids, weights, measures, music, etc.).

The possibility of dividing the work into four distinct sections and the nature of the nineteenth book suggest that it was carefully planned. The books may or may not have been composed in the order in which we find them, but it is evident that Bartholomaeus wrote with a definite order in mind. The nature of the *Prohemium* and the references throughout the work to following or preceding books indicate that the books were composed in their present order. In the introduction to the first book, for example, the preference which is given to the spiritual is stressed:

De proprietatibus itaque et naturis rerum, tam spiritualium quam corporalium, elucidare aliqua cupientes, ab illo sumamus exordium, qui est Alpha et O, principium et finis omnium bonorum.

Schönbach suggested that Bartholomaeus took notes on his reading, arranged these in groups, and then compiled his encyclopaedia.³² This suggestion was due to his desire to show that Bartholomaeus could have written the *De Proprietatibus*

³² P. 65.

Rerum in Saxony, even if a good library had not been accessible to him. Schönbach's conclusion concerning the method is that:

Die Sammlung des Stoffes aber wird dann wahrscheinlich noch vor seine Wirksamkeit in Paris fallen, die Bücher wird er bei den Oxforder Gelehrten gefunden haben, in Paris mag das Werk fortgesetzt, in Magdeburg abgeschlossen worden sein.

It is impossible to prove or disprove this statement, since all opinions concerning Bartholomaeus' method of composition must necessarily be mere conjectures. But, as already intimated, it seems probable that Bartholomaeus completed his work while he was still in Paris, where the works of the best authorities were to be had.

Bartholomaeus used three methods in referring to his sources. Sometimes he cited an author or work by name without quoting directly, such as the reference to Boethius' *De Trinitate* in the third chapter of the first book. This method is used most frequently when Bartholomaeus has given an explanation of his own and then has added 'as says Augustine,' or some other author, meaning that the ideas of that author are essentially the same as his own. More frequently he adapts the words of his authority to his own use by means of an elaborate paraphrase. An interesting use of this method is to be found in the twentieth chapter of the first book, the discussion of the names of God. The chief source for this chapter is the *De Fide Orthodoxa* (Book 1, chap. 12) by John of Damascus. John gives a rather free adaptation of part of the first chapter of the Dionysian *De Divinis Nominibus*, and Bartholomaeus in turn paraphrases this version. At other times Bartholomaeus quotes directly from his sources. The correctness of quotation depends, of course, upon the correctness of the manuscript or translation that Bartholomaeus could obtain. He does not always give a reference to book and chapter, for he is very fond of using the phrase 'ut dicit' at the beginning or end of a quotation without reference even to the work.

Bartholomaeus' chief source is Isidore's *Etymologies*, which he cites in approximately 660 chapters. Many of the quotations from the Bible or the ancient poets were taken from Isidore's work. In fact, the great encyclopaedist of the seventh century seems to have been his guide both for subject matter and arrangement. After the *Etymologies* and the Bible, Aristotle's

works are most frequently cited. Bartholomaeus knew all the works of Aristotle in translation from the Arabic. When he refers to the new translation as in Book 8, chapter 2: 'De istius celi natura dicitur in Libro de Celo et Mundo secundum nouam translationem,' he does not mean the translation from the Greek but the second translation from the Arabic. Bartholomaeus was also well acquainted with the Arabian commentaries upon Aristotle's works. In many of the 275 chapters in which the works of Aristotle are cited the Commentator is mentioned. In some cases it is difficult to identify the treatise to which Bartholomaeus is referring. For instance, in the seventeenth chapter of Book 3 there is the following reference: 'Dicit enim Aristotelis in xix. Libro de Animalibus.' According to the modern division no treatise has nineteen books. After diligently searching, I discovered that Bartholomaeus was here referring to the fifth book of the *De Generatione Animalium*. Likewise, by 'Libro .xii.' he means the second book of the *De Partibus Animalium*. It therefore appears that the scribes of the Middle Ages combined under one title all the Aristotelian treatises upon a single subject. The treatises upon animals were evidently combined in this order: *Historia Animalium* (1-9), *De Motu Animalium* and *De Incessu Animalium* (10), *De Partibus Animalium* (11-14), and *De Generatione Animalium* (15-19). The *De Motu Animalium* and the *De Incessu Animalium* may have been considered separate books, one being the tenth and the other the twentieth book of the collection.

Although Bartholomaeus used Isidore's *Etymologies* and the works of Aristotle as the principal sources for his encyclopaedia, he cited numerous minor authors in the different sections of the work. In the list of authorities at the beginning of the printed editions, there are one hundred and five names, but this list is neither complete nor accurate. The chief authorities for the theological portions (Books 1-3) are the Pseudo-Dionysian writings, St. Augustine, St. Gregory, and the *De Fide Orthodoxa* by John of Damascus. The medical part (4-7) is based upon the works of Constantinus Africanus, Galen, Hippocrates, and Avicenna, while the sources for the scientific section are Pliny, Dioscorides, Platerius, Isaac Judaeus, Bede, Jerome, and Ptolemy. Bartholomaeus appears to have been acquainted with the Greek and Latin classics, but the scientific

nature of his work prevented him from quoting from them extensively. Virgil is mentioned about fifteen times, Cicero twice, Ovid seven times, Horace twice, Lucan eight times, Homer ten times, Plato seven times, and Herodotus and Orosius sixteen times each.

Schönbach was the first to call attention to the fact that 'Bartholomaeus Anglicus schreibt nämlich in Kursus, und zwar in einer ziemlich streng ausgebildeten Art dieser Kunstprosa. . . . Wo dieser Kursus ganz unbeengt waltet, da wird man wohl annehmen dürfen, dass Bartholomaeus selber spricht.'³³ It is not necessary to resort to this method to identify Bartholomaeus' own work, since he is always careful to cite the authorities when he has quoted directly. Schönbach's theory that the frequency of the use of the Kursus may be a test of the time of composition is hardly plausible, for Bartholomaeus uses the Kursus throughout the work in nearly the same proportion. The use in passages directly quoted or paraphrased naturally depends upon the practice of the author quoted. The short introduction to the first book is an excellent example of Bartholomaeus' use of the Kursus:

De proprietatibus itaque et naturis rerum, tam spiritualium quam, corporalium, elucidare aliqua cupientes, ab illo sumamus exórdium, qui est Alpha et O, principium et finem omnium bonorum; in principio, patris luminum, a quo, procedit omne datum optimum et omne dónum perféctum, implorantes auxilium, vt ille, qui illuminat omnem hominem venientem in hunc mundum, et reuelat profúnda de ténebris, et abscondita producit in lúcem, huic opusculo, quod ad ipsius laudem et legentium vtilitatem de diuersis et sanctorum philosophorum dictis non sine labore recolligere iam incepti, felicem dignetur impendere consummatiónem.

Occasionally a regular Kursus is wanting where we should expect it, as in the phrase 'recolligere iam incepti.' It is evident, however, that Bartholomaeus tried to give a rhythmic quality to his prose by the use of this rather popular mediaeval device.

Bartholomaeus' style is in general remarkably clear. He paid more attention to grammar than many of the mediaeval authors and seldom used the wrong case or number. The use of long and involved sentences, which in some cases result from his writing in Kursus, offers the greatest difficulty to the reader. An example of this tendency is the passage just quoted. Here *implorantes auxilium* is separated from *patris luminum* for

³³ P. 67.

this reason. If we consider the nature of his work, Bartholomaeus used few uncommon or difficult words. He seems continually to have remembered that he was not writing for scholars, but for students and members of the clergy, who had not had the opportunities of an university education. The *De Proprietatibus Rerum* is a typical example of mediaeval Latin. Bartholomaeus' Latinity is not as polished and accurate as that of John of Salisbury, nor as bad as that of many minor authors, who neglected every rule of grammar and rhetoric.

The popularity which the *De Proprietatibus Rerum* attained before the close of the thirteenth century was not diminished in the following century. The manuscript copies multiplied rapidly and found their way to all the countries of western Europe. Many of the university and public libraries of Europe possess a copy of the Latin text or of one of the six translations. At present there are over one hundred copies of the Latin text in the libraries of Europe. The oldest manuscripts date from the thirteenth century, but the largest number belongs to the fourteenth century. During the fifteenth century a few manuscript copies were made, but in this century the printed editions began to take the place of these copies.

Before the end of the thirteenth century Bartholomaeus' work had become a source for moral works, such as the *Proprietates Rerum Moralizatae*. Part of the ninth book of the *Roman d'Alexandre*—Proprietez des beses qui ont magnitude, force, et pouvoir en leur brutalitez—is almost entirely copied from the *De Proprietatibus Rerum*.³⁴ Furthermore, this encyclopaedia was recognized as one of the principal works of reference at the University of Paris in 1286, for it is entered in a list of books to be lent to students:³⁵

Librorum theologiae et philosophiae et juris pretium ab Universitate Parisiensi taxatum quod debent habere librarii pro exemplari commodato scholaribus.

Item, liber de Proprietatibus rerum continet c et ii pecias. iiii sol.

A copy was also chained to a desk in the chapel of the Sorbonne. In 1297 Benedict XI considered this book a fitting gift to be offered to a convent of Dominicans, and in 1329 another Pope, John XXII, paid nine florins of gold for a copy. In a

³⁴ Pouchet, *Histoire des Sciences Naturelles au Moyen Age*, p. 486.

³⁵ Denifle, *Chartularium Universitatis Parisiensis*, 1:644.

safe conduct, given by Charles VI to a minorite who wished to return to England with four books, which he had purchased in Paris, the *De Proprietatibus Rerum* is the only one mentioned by name:³⁶

Nous voulons et nous mandons que Frère Robert Chambrilen, religieux de l'Ordre des Frères-Mineurs du couvent de Londres en Angleterre, lequel a acheté dans notre ville de Paris quatre volumes, dont l'un est intitulé, *De la Propriété des Choses*, livres avec lesquels ledit Frère veut s'en retourner a son couvent, vous le laissiez passer avec les dits livres.

During the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries the *De Proprietatibus Rerum* was translated into six of the European languages—French, English, Spanish, Dutch, Provençal, and Italian. The French translation was made at the command of Charles V by an Augustinian monk, Jean Corbechon, about whom nothing further is known. This translation was finished and presented to the King in 1372. There are about thirty-five manuscript copies of this translation extant. Corbechon followed his original closely but added some comments of his own.

The English translation was made by John Trevisa, who has been called the 'father of English Prose.'³⁷ Trevisa finished his work on the sixth of February, 1398 at Berkeley, where he was chaplain to Sir Thomas Berkeley, at whose command he had undertaken the work. There are six manuscripts of the complete work and three of portions still extant in England. Trevisa, like Corbechon, added to the original. These additions were usually annotations of a difficult passage. The translator was always careful to distinguish his own work from that of the author by prefacing the annotations with his name. For example, in the eighteenth chapter of the second book there is a long explanation of horizon, beginning: '*Trevisa*. Oryson is a straunge terme and moche used in astronomye.' This translation is not only valuable on account of its importance as a scientific text for the English authors of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, but also because it would furnish much material to the student of language, if a definitive edition were undertaken. Babington's statement concerning the value of

³⁶ Matrod, p. 477.

³⁷ The fullest account of Trevisa is given by the Rev. H. J. Wilkins, *John Wycliffe. Also John de Trevisa*, London, 1915.

Trevisa's translation of the *Polychronicon* may be equally applied to the translation of the *De Proprietatibus Rerum*.³⁸

As one of the earliest specimens of English prose, containing many rare words and curious expressions, the version of Trevisa will be gladly welcomed by philologists, who will not be over severe upon his errors.

Vincent de Burgos, the translator of the Spanish version, was also an unknown monk, who probably finished his translation during the last quarter of the fourteenth century or early in the fifteenth. I have been able to find record of only two manuscripts of this version, one in Brussels and the other in the British Museum. The name of the author and the date of the Dutch translation are not known. It is probable that this translation was undertaken for the printer of the 1485 edition, as there are no manuscripts in existence.

Until the last decade of the nineteenth century these four translations were thought to be the only ones that had been made. In 1889 Appel³⁹ showed that the Provençal *Elucidari de las Proprietatz de totes Res Naturals*, which Bartsch had thought was based upon the Latin *Lucidarius* and other encyclopaedias, especially the *Etymologies* by Isidore, was in reality a translation of the *De Proprietatibus Rerum*. Appel's discussion concerning the date of the translation and the count for whom it was made is of little value because he believed that Bartholomaeus lived about 1360. It was probably translated at the command of Gaston Phébus, Comte de Foix, who died in 1391. The unique manuscript of this translation is to be found in Paris.

In 1902 Cian proved that Vivaldo Belcalzer's *Trattato di Scienza Universal* was an Italian translation of the *De Proprietatibus Rerum*. Belcalzer must have translated the work early in the fourteenth century, for the last references to him in official documents are under the years 1307 and 1308. He was a lawyer by profession and had held government positions at various times. Belcalzer probably undertook the translation of a Latin manuscript in the possession of the Bonacolsi and at their desire, for he dedicated his work to Guido Bonacolsi. Cian gives a full account of three manuscripts of the Italian

³⁸ Babington, C., *Higden's Polychronicon*, 1, xli.

³⁹ "Der Provenzalische Lucidarius," *Zeit. für Rom. Phil.*, 13:225-52.

Copies of one or more of these editions are to be found in the more important libraries of Europe and America.

Undoubtedly M. Matrod's estimate of the importance of the *De Proprietatibus Rerum* is greatly exaggerated. Its importance to Shakespeare and the writers of the Elizabethan Age was great, but not so great that its place could not have been taken by some of the other compilations of the time. Bartholomaeus' encyclopaedia did not owe its popularity, which it enjoyed until the seventeenth century, to originality of material, but to its being essentially a text-book of theology and the sciences. It met the special need of the increasing number of students without exhausting their patience. The order in which the material was presented was so arranged that extracts could easily be made. At the same time the work was valuable as a bibliographical manual, for Bartholomaeus seldom failed to give an authority for his statements or to suggest to the reader the book which would give him a fuller account than a short chapter could conveniently contain.

Such was the value of the *De Proprietatibus Rerum* to the student of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. What is its chief value to the scholar of the present day? In the first place, it is important as an historical document, which will help us to understand the thoughts of the students of the Middle Ages concerning theology, medicine, and natural science. But even more important to the scholar are the translations of the *De Proprietatibus Rerum*, for they are among the earliest prose works written in the vernacular.

GERALD. E. SE BOYAR

White Plains, N. Y.